

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JEFFREY M. BARSHAW, and CINDY  
WIERSMA-BARSHAW, as individuals  
and as a marital community,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PILGRIM'S PRIDE COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C22-1673RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
EXCLUDE CERTAIN TESTIMONY OF  
PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED EXPERT  
JIMMY DARUWALLA, M.D.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Pilgrim's Pride Company ("Pilgrim's Pride")'s Motion to bar Jimmy Daruwalla, M.D. from testifying at trial about certain findings from his Independent Medical Evaluation. Dkt. #24. Plaintiffs Jeffrey Barshaw and Cindy Wiersma-Barshaw oppose. Dkt. #26.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The Court has set out the facts of this case previously and will only summarize the relevant facts here. On November 6, 2019, Mr. Barshaw purchased a box of "Country Post" brand chicken, manufactured by Pilgrim's Pride. Dkt. #1-3. Once home, Mr. Barshaw proceeded to

1 open one of the sealed bags of chicken, reached in, and had his palm pierced by a pair of metal  
2 shears inside the bag. *Id.*

3 On March 15, 2023, Dr. Jimmy Hoshang Daruwalla, M.D. (“Dr. Daruwalla”), conducted  
4 an Independent Medical Evaluation (“IME”) of Mr. Barshaw’s injury. Dkt. #25-1. Dr.  
5 Daruwalla proposes to offer his expert opinion that Mr. Barshaw has a “left median nerve  
6 laceration and injury related, on a more-probable-than-not basis, to the injury on November 6,  
7 2019.” *Id.* at 13.

9 A bench trial is set in this matter for September 18, 2023.

### 10 III. DISCUSSION

#### 11 A. Legal Standard

12 Federal Rule of Evidence 702 provides that a witness who is qualified as an expert by  
13 knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion or  
14 otherwise if:  
15

- 16 (a) the expert’s scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of
- 17 fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue;
- 18 (b) the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data;
- 19 (c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and
- (d) the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

20 “Under Rule 702, the trial court acts as a gatekeeper and ensures that the proffered scientific  
21 testimony meets certain standards of both relevance and reliability before it is admitted.”  
22 *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579, 590 (1993). However, the district court’s  
23 gatekeeping function is less critical in a bench trial as judges are less likely than jurors to be  
24 prejudiced by inadmissible expert opinions. *See Shore v. Mohave Cty.*, 644 F.2d 1320, 1322-23  
25 (9th Cir. 1981). Where a judge is the finder of fact, the evidentiary standards related to the  
26 admissibility and consideration of evidence are relaxed as the judge can more appropriately  
27  
28

1 consider the objectionable evidence and it remains subject to exclusion or disregard. *See*  
2 *E.E.O.C. v. Farmer Bros. Co.*, 31 F.3d 891, 898 (9th Cir. 1994) (noting that “in a bench trial, the  
3 risk that a verdict will be affected unfairly and substantially by the admission of irrelevant  
4 evidence is far less than in a jury trial”).

5 As an initial matter, the Court must determine whether the proffered witness is qualified  
6 as an expert by “knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 702.  
7 Because the Rule “contemplates a *broad conception* of expert qualifications,” only a “*minimal*  
8 *foundation* of knowledge, skill, and experience” is required. *Hangerter v. Provident Life &*  
9 *Accident Ins. Co.*, 373 F.3d 998, 1015-16 (9th Cir. 2004) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Thomas*  
10 *v. Newton Int’l Enters.*, 42 F.3d 1266, 1269 (9th Cir. 1994)). A “lack of particularized expertise  
11 goes to the weight of [the] testimony, not its admissibility.” *United States v. Garcia*, 7 F.3d 885,  
12 890 (9th Cir. 1993) (citing *United States v. Little*, 753 F.2d 1420, 1445 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984)); *Daubert*  
13 *v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.* (“*Daubert II*”), 43 F.3d 1311, 1315 (9th Cir. 1995).

14 The trial court must also ensure that the proffered expert testimony is reliable. Generally,  
15 to satisfy Rule 702’s reliability requirement, “the party presenting the expert must show that the  
16 expert’s findings are based on sound science, and this will require some objective, independent  
17 validation of the expert’s methodology.” *Daubert II*, 43 F.3d at 1316. Toward this end, the  
18 Supreme Court in *Daubert I* set forth the following factors for the trial court to consider when  
19 assessing the reliability of proffered expert testimony: (1) whether the expert’s method, theory,  
20 or technique is generally accepted within the relevant scientific community; (2) whether the  
21 method, theory, or technique can be (and has been) tested; (3) whether the method, theory, or  
22 technique has been subjected to peer review and publication; and (4) the known or potential rate  
23 of error of the method, theory, or technique. *Daubert I*, 509 U.S. at 593-94. An expert opinion  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 is reliable if it is based on proper methods and procedures rather than “subjective belief or  
2 unsupported speculation.” *Id.* at 590. The test for reliability “is not the correctness of the  
3 expert’s conclusions but the soundness of his methodology.” *Stilwell v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*,  
4 482 F.3d 1187, 1192 (9th Cir. 2007) (quoting *Daubert II*, 43 F.3d at 1318).

5       Alternative or opposing opinions or tests do not “preclude the admission of the expert’s  
6 testimony – they go to the *weight*, not the admissibility.” *Kennedy v. Collagen Corp.*, 161 F.3d  
7 1226, 1231 (9th Cir. 1998). Furthermore, “[d]isputes as to the strength of [an expert’s]  
8 credentials, faults in his use of [a particular] methodology, or lack of textual authority for his  
9 opinion, go to the weight, not the admissibility, of his testimony.” *Id.* (quoting *McCulloch v.*  
10 *H.B. Fuller Co.*, 61 F.3d 1038, 1044 (2d Cir. 1995)).

11       Finally, the Court must ensure that the proffered expert testimony is relevant. As  
12 articulated in Rule 702, expert testimony is relevant if it assists the trier of fact in understanding  
13 evidence or in determining a fact in issue. *Daubert I*, 509 U.S. at 591. Thus, the party proffering  
14 such evidence must demonstrate a valid scientific connection, or “fit,” between the evidence and  
15 an issue in the case. *Id.* Expert testimony is inadmissible if it concerns factual issues within the  
16 knowledge and experience of ordinary lay people because it would not assist the trier of fact in  
17 analyzing the evidence. In the Ninth Circuit, “[t]he general test regarding the admissibility of  
18 expert testimony is whether the jury can receive ‘appreciable help’ from such testimony.” *United*  
19 *States v. Gwaltney*, 790 F.2d 1378, 1381 (9th Cir. 1986). Because unreliable and unfairly  
20 prejudicial expert witness testimony is not helpful to the trier of fact, the trial court should exclude  
21 such evidence. *Jinro Am., Inc. v. Secure Invs., Inc.*, 266 F.3d 993, 1004 (9th Cir. 2001). Likewise,  
22 expert testimony that merely tells the jury what result to reach is inadmissible. Fed. R. Evid. 704,  
23 Advisory Committee Note (1972); *see, e.g., United States v. Duncan*, 42 F.3d 97, 101 (2d Cir.

1 1994) (“When an expert undertakes to tell the jury what result to reach, this does not *aid* the jury  
2 in making a decision, but rather attempts to substitute the expert’s judgment for the jury’s.”).

### 3 **B. Analysis**

4 Pilgrim’s Pride seeks to exclude certain parts of Dr. Daruwalla’s testimony regarding the  
5 Independent Medical Evaluation he conducted earlier this year. The testimony in dispute relates  
6 to the potential consequences of Mr. Barshaw’s delayed reporting to an emergency room, a burn  
7 injury Mr. Barshaw sustained, Mr. Barshaw’s alleged ongoing synovitis, inflammation,  
8 contractures, and scarring, Mr. Barshaw’s ability to perform a pinch grip test, and Mr. Barshaw’s  
9 insurance status and his inability to pay for surgery. Pilgrim’s Pride argues that this testimony  
10 should be excluded for three main reasons: (1) the testing employed by Dr. Daruwalla undermined  
11 the scientific validity and reliability of his opinion, (2) Dr. Daruwalla’s testimony is contradictory  
12 and unreliable, and (3) Dr. Daruwalla lacks the necessary expertise and factual basis for such  
13 opinions.  
14

15  
16 The Court finds that Pilgrim’s Pride’s arguments all go to the weight, not the admissibility  
17 of Dr. Daruwalla’s testimony and thus, are allowed. Furthermore, because this is a bench trial,  
18 the Court is more than capable of ruling on these issues at or after trial and finds that Pilgrim’s  
19 Pride’s concerns are best addressed through cross-examination and the presentation of contrary  
20 evidence for the following reasons.  
21

#### 22 **1. Qualification**

23  
24 After reviewing the submitted materials, the Court finds Dr. Daruwalla qualified to opine  
25 on Mr. Barshaw’s condition based on the evaluations and tests he conducted. Because Rule 702  
26 contemplates a broad conception of expert qualifications, only a minimal foundation of  
27  
28

1 knowledge, skill, and experience is required. *Hagarter, supra*. The Court’s review of the attached  
2 exhibits demonstrates Dr. Daruwalla has the necessary foundation as to the issues presented here.

## 3 **2. Reliability and Relevance**

### 4 **i. Findings from the Tinel and Two-Point Tests**

5 Pilgrim’s Pride asserts that Dr. Daruwalla’s “reliance on subjective data makes his  
6 methodology questionable and untrustworthy.” Dkt. #24 at 5. Specifically, Pilgrim’s Pride  
7 argues that the Tinel and the Two-Point Discrimination tests were based on subjective reporting  
8 from Mr. Barshaw and that alternative, objective tests should have been administered. *Id.*  
9 Although the Court acts as a gatekeeper here, it will not weigh whether an allegedly more  
10 objective test would have been better. Pilgrim’s Pride does not adequately explain why Dr.  
11 Daruwalla’s reliance on Mr. Barshaw’s statements and his own experience in conducting these  
12 tests negates his ability to opine on Mr. Barshaw’s condition. The tests employed by Dr.  
13 Daruwalla appear to be of sound methodology for developing his opinion. Thus, this will not  
14 serve as a basis to exclude this testimony. Pilgrim’s Pride is free to argue at trial that Dr.  
15 Daruwalla’s findings should not be afforded much weight because the tests he administered rely  
16 on subjective reporting.  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **ii. Dr. Daruwalla’s opinion about the consequences of Mr. Barshaw’s** 21 **delayed reporting to an emergency room.**

22 Pilgrim’s Pride next argues that Dr. Daruwalla’s opinion about the consequences of Mr.  
23 Barshaw’s delayed reporting to an emergency room should be excluded because his testimony is  
24 contradictory. The statements made by Dr. Daruwalla do not render his opinion irrelevant or  
25 inadmissible. Dr. Daruwalla explained the context of his statements and restated his opinion on  
26 Mr. Barshaw’s condition. Pilgrim’s Pride is free to attack Dr. Daruwalla’s opinion on cross-  
27 examination.  
28

**iii. Dr. Daruwalla's opinion about whether Mr. Barshaw burned his hand.**

Pilgrim's Pride next argues that Dr. Daruwalla's opinion on Mr. Barshaw's burn injury should be excluded because he is not a burn expert, and thus lacks the necessary expertise to opine on this matter. It is not clear to the Court that Dr. Daruwalla intends to testify outside his area of expertise. Dr. Daruwalla explains in his declaration that as an experienced hand surgeon, he "has treated all manner of hand injuries, including burn injuries," and that his "opinions on the cause of his burn are based on sufficient facts and data and are the product of reliable principles and methods." Dkt. #28 ¶¶ 17-18. Disagreement as to this issue can be addressed through objections at trial.

**iv. Dr. Daruwalla's opinion about Mr. Barshaw's alleged ongoing synovitis, inflammation, contractures, and scarring.**

Pilgrim's Pride next argues that Dr. Daruwalla's opinion about Mr. Barshaw's ongoing synovitis, inflammation, contractures, and scarring should be excluded for two reasons: (1) no concrete evidence exists to support these conditions and (2) Dr. Daruwalla relied on Mr. Barshaw's statements that he could not fully flex certain muscles to arrive at his conclusion. Similar to the discussion on the Tinel and Two-Point tests above, the Court finds that opinions derived from tests that rely on subjective elements do not necessarily render the opinions inadmissible. Pilgrim's Pride is more than free to attack Dr. Daruwalla's opinions on cross-examination.

**v. Dr. Daruwalla's opinion about Mr. Barshaw's ability to perform a pinch grip test.**

Pilgrim's Pride next argues that Dr. Daruwalla's opinion about Mr. Barshaw's ability to perform a pinch grip test should be excluded because Dr. Daruwalla did not conduct such test. Rather, Dr. Daruwalla relied on another expert's assessment to arrive to this conclusion. "[W]hile

1 a court may reject wholly speculative or unfounded testimony, it abuses its discretion if it  
 2 overlooks relevant data submitted as the foundation of an expert's remarks." *Elosu v. Middlefork*  
 3 *Ranch Inc.*, 26 F.4th 1017, 1025 (9th Cir. 2022). Dr. Daruwalla asserts his opinion regarding Mr.  
 4 Barshaw's inability to perform a pinch test was based on Dr. Christopher Olch's findings, Mr.  
 5 Barshaw's medical records, and his own experience. Dkt. #28. It appears Dr. Barshaw's findings  
 6 are based on both his own expertise and that of others. Given that this is a bench trial, the Court  
 7 will not exclude this testimony. Any potential issues can be dealt with during the bench trial.

9 **vi. Findings made by Dr. Daruwalla that were not included in the IME**  
 10 **Report.**

11 The Ninth Circuit has held that "a treating physician is only exempt from Rule  
 12 26(a)(2)(B)'s written report requirement to the extent that [their] opinions were formed during  
 13 the course of treatment." *Goodman v. Staples the Off. Superstore, LLC*, 644 F.3d 817, 826 (9th  
 14 Cir, 2011). Thus, under Rule 26(a)(2), Dr. Daruwalla is allowed to testify about his findings even  
 15 if these were not included in his IME Report, so long as his testimony relates to opinions formed  
 16 during the course of treatment.

18 **vii. Dr. Daruwalla's opinion about Mr. Barshaw's insurance status and his**  
 19 **inability to pay for surgery.**

20 Finally, Pilgrim's Pride argues that Dr. Daruwalla's opinion about Mr. Barshaw's  
 21 insurance status and his inability to pay for surgery should be excluded because Dr. Daruwalla  
 22 lacks the necessary expertise to arrive at these conclusions. Mr. Barshaw refutes this contention  
 23 by arguing that Dr. Daruwalla's opinion was specific to his office's insurance practice, not  
 24 insurance practice in general. Dr. Daruwalla is limited to testimony regarding the common  
 25 insurance practices he has observed within his office, as he has not established his expertise in  
 26 this field to speak about it generally.  
 27  
 28



**IV. CONCLUSION**

Having considered the briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Pilgrim's Pride Company's Motion to Exclude Certain Testimony of Plaintiff's Proposed Expert Jimmy Daruwalla, M.D., Dkt. #24, is DENIED.

DATED this 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2023.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE